

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 15, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-28 are now pending in this application. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Claims 1-28 stand rejected.

The rejection of Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,570,403) in view of Hsieh et al. (6,639,965) is respectfully traversed.

Yamazaki et al. describe a dual energy scanning type x-ray CT apparatus including two adjacent detectors (1 and 2). The detectors are provided to detect different energy characteristics from each other. Column 4, lines 13-15. However, the only means disclosed by which detector cells detect different energy characteristics (other than being illuminated with different energy x-rays) is either by having different thickness scintillators or being provided x-ray absorption filters that differ from one another. See col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 19. Nowhere is it disclosed or suggested to have "detector cells that are at least one of manufactured from different materials that are sensitive to different portions of the x-ray spectrum or coated with different scintillating materials that are sensitive to a different portion of the x-ray spectrum," as recited in Applicant's Claim 1, as herein amended. See Applicant's specification as originally filed, at the final sentence of paragraph [0039], for example.

Hsieh is directed to a CT imaging system and method and does disclose a source pitch of 1:1 is used in order to ensure continuity of projection data. However, Hsieh is directed to conventional single-energy CT and therefore does add anything to Yamazaki et al. to teach or suggest "detector cells that are at least one of manufactured from different materials that are sensitive to different portions of the x-ray spectrum or coated with different scintillating materials that are sensitive to a different portion of the x-ray spectrum," as recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh.

Claims 2-13 depend from independent Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 2-13 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2-13 are also patentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh.

This rejection no longer applies to Claim 14, because Claim 14 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 14 over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh should be withdrawn.

Claim 15, as herein amended, recites a feature similar to that recited in Claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that Claim 15 is also patentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh for reasons similar to those given with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 16, as herein amended, recites a feature similar to that recited in Claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that Claim 16 is also patentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh for reasons similar to those given with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 17-23 depend from independent Claim 16. When the recitations of Claims 17-23 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 17-23 are also patentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-23 over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 24-28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yamazaki et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claims 24 and 26 have each been amended to recite a feature similar to that discussed above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh. It is therefore submitted that Claims 24 and 26 are also patentable over

Yamazaki et al. (as well as Yamazaki et al. in view of Hsieh) for reasons similar to those given with respect to Claim 1.

Claim 25 depends from independent Claim 24, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claim 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claim 25 is also patentable over Yamazaki et al.

Claims 27-28 depend from independent Claim 26, which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 27-28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 26, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 27-28 are also patentable over Yamazaki et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102 rejections of Claims 24-28 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Alan L. Cassel
Registration No. 35,842
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070